

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

MERCE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                           | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/891,612                                | 06/27/2001      | Mamoru Nakasuji      | 010816                  | 8832             |  |
| 38834                                     | 7590 10/21/2004 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
| WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP |                 |                      | BERMAN                  | BERMAN, JACK I   |  |
| 1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW<br>SUITE 700  |                 | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER            |                  |  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20036                      |                 |                      | 2881                    |                  |  |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action   | 09/891,612  | NAKASUJI ET AL.  |  |  |  |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|   | Jack I. Berman  | 2881   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence address  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avignal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | roid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment which<br>(with appeal fee); or (3) a timely  | ation. A proper reply to a not places the application in   |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | PLY [check either a) or b)]   |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire leads on the Control of | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth the ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing. FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |   |  |  |  |  |
| (a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s   | see NOTE below);   |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | elow);  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or   | n better form for appeal by mate  | rially reducing or simplifying the   |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancelli   | ng a corresponding number of fi   | nally rejected claims.   |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.   |   | •  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | ion(s):   |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   | be allowable if submitted in a se   | eparate, timely filed amendment  |  |  |  |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |   |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected:  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr   | oved or b) disapproved by the   | ne Examiner.   |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer  | nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  | <del>.</del>   |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |   | ·  |  |  |  |
| •   | . 0   | Jack Deuman<br>Jack I. Berman<br>Primary Examiner<br>Art Unit: 2881  |  |  |  |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Previous claims did not claim that the pressure of the mini-environment chamber is equal to atmospheric pressure.